WHIG ADVOCATE.

CANTON, MISS.

SATURDAY::::::::::OCTOBER 19, 1839.

"The Union of the Whigs, for the sake of the Union."

FOR PRESIDENT,
HENRY CLAY, of Ky.
FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
JOHN TYLER, of Va.
Subject to the decision of a National Convention.

FOR UNITED STATES SENATE.
S. S. PRENTISS.
FOR GOVERNOR,
EDWARD TURNER.
FOR CONGRESS,
ADAM L. BINGAMAN,
REUBEN DAVIS.
FOR SECRETARY OF STATE,
DUDLEY S. JENNINGS.
FOR STATE TREASURER,
GIDEON FITZ.
FOR AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS,
JOHN CRUSOE.

Gen. G. W. Terrell and the Editor of this Paper.

We have noticed a communication over the signature of G. W. Terrell, published in the Southern Sun of the 8th inst., in which he abuses C. C. Shackleford, Esq., the Editor of this paper, in no very mild terms. The reason he assigns for so doing is, that the Editor of this paper charged him, in a late number of the Advocate, with being the author of a communication published in the Vicksburg Sentinel, in which an over-wrought and fulsome account was given of Gen. Terrell's reply to Mr. R. Davis, in Canton, last summer; that this reply to Mr. Davis "was made up of quotations from 8th January speeches, &c.;" that he had written a letter to the Editor of the Advocate, accompanied by a statement made by W. G. Haun, with the view of exculpating himself from the charge; and that the Editor of this paper refused to him "the privilege of vindicating himself through the same channel,"—meaning the Whig Advocate. With this letter the author caused to be published, also, the one he says he addressed to the Editor of the Advocate, the refusal to publish which was his ground of complaint.

We had not, before we saw this last letter in the Sun, seen or read it; and could not, therefore, decide whether Mr. Shackleford was right or not in saying it was not sufficiently "respectful and courteous," and in refusing for this reason to publish it. But now, after we have carefully read it in the Sun, we hesitate not to express our decided opinion that he acted as became a gentleman, in refusing to publish it; and that even Gen. Terrell himself has no *good* reason to complain of the refusal. And in order that all who peruse this article may judge whether *our* opinion is correct, we will here make an extract from the letter itself. He said that the "press" of the present day has, to use his own words, "degenerated into a mere conduit of *vile slander* and personal abuse—the *abandoned vehicle of foul defamation, spitting its venom over the fairest characters in our country. From this general character, I have been in the habit of considering the paper you conduct exempt, and have frequently so expressed myself; but, sir, your remarks accompanying my letter, are of a character so illiberal and injurious to me, personally, as to force me to alter that opinion,"* &c.

Now is there a man who knows any thing of the English language, and who has ever looked into a dictionary for the meaning of the terms "*respectful* and *courteous*," that will venture to say that the language used by Gen. Terrell, in the above extract, *is respectful* and *courteous?* If there be, he deserves to be characterised as a "liliputian intellect," indeed. The only meaning we can attach to this extract is, that Gen. Terrell tells the Editor of the Advocate that his paper is a "conduit of vile slander," "the abandoned vehicle of foul defamation," &c.; and, then asks the Editor to publish in his own paper this grossly insulting language!! Well, what said the Editor about it, and what did he? He did not, in his notice of the letter, vent his spleen, for he harbored none, we think, against Gen. Terrell. No. But in language, mild and gentlemanly, and in a spirit and temper that would do honor to the most benevolent professor of our holy religion, said that Gen. Terrell's letter was not sufficiently "respectful and courteous" to be admitted into his paper; leaving the General to infer, that if its tone should be altered, it would be allowed a place in his columns to vindicate him from the charge which the Editor had made—a charge in the making of which, according to his previous declaration, he was "actuated by no unkind or malignant feeling to Gen. Terrell." We leave it to the reader then—nay, we would be willing to leave it to Gen. Terrell himself in his calm, dispassionate moments, to say whether the Editor has been guilty of denying "to the individual thus injured, the privilege of *vindicating* himself through the same channel." This privilege, *we think*, Gen. Terrell is mistaken in supposing was denied to him:—but the privilege of abusing the Editor, and this too in his own paper, we admit was denied him, and every just man must say, justly denied. And Gen. Terrell must so regard it when he reflects calmly and dispassionately upon the subject.

We are sorry to see that General Terrell did not confine himself to the ostensible object of his communication, to wit: the exculpation of himself from the charges which he said the Editor of the Advocate had made and "insidiously, and by inuendo" reiterated. He has ventured to give the public a biography of "this *redoubtable* and *dignified* Editor," as he sneeringly styles him. He asks *who* is this Editor? And thus answers his own question: "*Three* years ago he was a little whiffling *county* court lawyer, *without business or prospects*, until he was *taken up* by Col. Fulton, of this county, who *gave* him a partnership, and shortly afterwards retired, *leaving* him a *good* practice, and now the *viper* has turned upon his *benefactor*, and clenched his poisonous fangs into the bosom that warmed him into life. Scarcely one of his papers comes out that does not contain some *abuse* and even *slander* against Col. Fulton."

We have taken the liberty as we did in the first extract we made, to put some of the words of this quotation in italics, in order that the mind of the reader may mark such as are considered objectionable. And we here take occasion, once for all, to assure Gen. Terrell that it is not our purpose to retort, for the absent Editor of this paper, the unnecessary, and to those who know the Editor *harmless*, abuse he has endeavored to heap upon him. Nor is it our purpose to deal in dark inuendoes, but to state what we are credibly informed are the *facts* which Gen. Terrell, we presume, *intended* to give in relation to this awful sin of ingratitude.

The Editor, C. C. Shackleford, Esq., sprung from one of the oldest and most respectable families in Kentucky, having received a liberal education, graduated at the Transylvania Law School, at Lexington, emigrated to the State of Mississippi, and settled in Canton, in the fall of 1835. *At* the spring term of the Circuit Court, 1836, he formed a partnership with Col. D. M. Fulton in the practice of law, at which term he had a few *cases*, as we are informed by a lawyer who was then practicing at the Canton bar, the name of C. C. Shackleford appearing on the docket *about as often* as Col. Fulton. During this year, Col. Fulton went to Texas leaving to Mr. Shackleford the task of attending to all old, and to get new business. At the spring term 1837, they dissolved partnership, or about that time. In the winter of 1838, he formed a partnership with his present partner, Hon. T. Shackleford; and they have for the last two years been engaged in a very *lucrative* practice, for which they are not indebted to Col. Fulton.

He came here not in a *dependent* condition. He brought means with him, and made investments soon after his arrival. With his mind which is naturally sprightly and vigorous, his amiable and gentlemanly deportment, his legal attainments, and industrious business habits, could he be said, in justice, to be "without business or *prospects*?" Could it be said that he was "*taken up*" by any body? Could it be said that any body "*gave* him a partnership." We would think not. If Col. Fulton proposed the partnership, (and we expect no one but the gentlemen themselves know *who* made it.—I say if it proceeded from Col. Fulton, it argues, we think, much in favor of the Col.'s good sense and discernment. It proves that Col. Fulton had the discrimination, *then*, to discover that Mr. Shackleford would do well, as it has since turned out—in other words, that he was *not* without "*prospects*."

We hope Gen. Terrell did not *intend* to injure Col. Fulton by informing the public that he had so little judgment as to form a *partnership* with, what he calls, "a *little whifling county* court lawyer, *without business or prospects*." We say, we hope so, because, entertaining the high opinion we do of Col. Fulton as a gentleman and man of sound judgment and discrimination, we would revolt at the idea of doing him such an injustice; and because if we wished to injure him by so doing, the high character the Col. sustains in this community would render such an effort in us perfectly harmless.

But take it on the supposition that Mr. Shackleford owes Col. Fulton a debt of gratitude for befriending him in the early part of his professional career, does it necessarily follow that Mr. Shackleford, a Whig in principle, and editing a Whig journal, is bound to advocate the election to the Senate of Col. Fulton, who belongs to the Van Buren party, and of course entertains political opinions the opposite of Mr. Shackleford? Does it follow that Mr. Shackleford must think through the ballance of his life, just as Col. Fulton does on political questions? If we have formed a correct estimate of Col. Fulton's character, and we think we have, he would spurn Mr. Shackleford from him as a wretch unworthy of his regard, were he to evince so little of the *true* democratic feeling, in so entire a want of independence. We think that Col. Fulton knows full well how to distinguish between a *political* and a *personal* enemy. He knows that the sternest political enemy and the warmest personal friend may exist in one and the same individual. And such we believe to be the case with Mr. Shackleford. We have been with him often during the present political canvass, and we do not recollect to have heard him in a single instance utter a feeling of *personal* ill will towards Col. Fulton; but on the contrary, while contending manfully and independently for his own political principles, he has spoken of Col. Fulton as it becomes him to speak of a personal friend.

We have been thus particular, and perhaps tedious, in presenting what we consider a correct view of the case, not to abuse or injure the feelings of Gen. Terrell, but as an act of justice to an absent friend. We believe that Gen. Terrell has misapprehended his motives; and that the excitement of his feelings produced by such misapprehensions and a consequent belief that he was intentionally injured, has betrayed him into the use of abusive language towards the Editor of the Advocate, which would not, we feel sure, have otherwise escaped him. We hope we are understood—we mean not to injure any one, but to present such a vindication of the absent Editor as the facts of the case seem to us, themselves to afford.

A Bankrupt Law.

During the heavy and almost unprecedented pecuniary distress under which the people are, at the present time, laboring, the numberless political doctors who court popular favor are preaching various remedies. None of these, we believe, would if tried, be productive of less benefit and more real injury to the people than a *Bankrupt* law, properly so called, whether we regard the hopeless prospect of substantial relief it would afford, or the blighting effect it would inevitably produce upon the credit of the State.

Such a law could not operate upon contracts *now* in existence; and yet such are the only contracts, we presume, upon which the friends of such a law desire it to operate. The passage of such a law would, then, work to the serious injury of the *debtor* class of the community; for no creditor would *renew* a debt or make any other *arrangement* than by *suit* for its collection, lest he should thereby incur the loss of the debt by means of the bankrupt law.

Furthermore, as the reader will perceive by reading the following extracts from standard law books on this subject, such a law could only operate *between those who are citizens of this State*, and *not* upon *foreigners*. The latter could collect their money through the Federal Courts in the very teeth of a State law. The necessary consequence would be, then, that those who owe debts *out* of the State, and have debts owing to them in the State would have to pay whether they could collect their dues or not, the law thus placing foreign creditors on a better footing than those who live in the State. This would be gross injustice.

What is a bankrupt law? It is thus defined by Justice Blackstone in the 2d volume of his commentaries, page 285, viz: "A *trader* who who secretes himself, or does certain other acts, tending to defraud his creditors." Bankruptcy has, according to the English law, long since, says Judge Kent, received "an appropriate meaning, and has been considered to be applicable only to unfortunate *traders*, or persons who get their livelihood by buying and selling, and who do certain acts which afford evidence of an intention to avoid payment of their debts."

"The legislature of the Union possesses the power of enacting bankrupt laws, and those of the States, the power of enacting insolvent laws; and a State has likewise authority to pass a bankrupt law. But no *State* bankrupt or insolvent law *can be permitted to impair the obligation of contracts;* and there must likewise be no act of Congress in existence on the subject, conflicting with such law. There is this further limitation, also, on the power of the separate States to pass bankrupt or insolvent laws, that *they cannot*, in the exercise of that power, *act upon the rights of the citizens of other States*." 2d vol. Kent's Commentaries, page 389, 390.

Again: "The exercise of the power residing in the States to pass bankrupt and insolvent laws does not impair, in the sense of the constitution, the obligation of contracts made *posterior* to the law; but the *discharge under a State law is no bar to a suit on a contract existing when the law was passed*, nor to an action by a *citizen of another State, in the Courts of the United States*, or of any other State than that where the discharge was obtained. *The discharge under a State law will not discharge a debt due to a citizen of another State. It will only operate upon contracts made within the State between its own citizens, or suitors subject to State power*." 2d vol. Kent's Commentaries, page 392–'3.

Such are the principles laid down on this subject by that able commentator—principles taken from the decisions repeatedly made by the Supreme Court of the United States. Are there any who will advocate such a law, knowing its meaning and its effects? We would hope not.

Okra Cotton.

A specimen of the Okra Cotton plant was shewn to us a day or two since by Dr. T. J. Catchings. It was taken from the plantation of Mr. Robert H. Cage, in Yazoo county.—About two feet four inches of the stalk, cut five feet from the ground, had twenty six grown bolls, and several others not matured, on it. There were two clusters of six bolls each, one of five, one of three, and another of two. The seed from which this stalk grew was planted after the 10th of May. On account of the continued dry weather last spring it did not sprout until about the 1st June. This species of Cotton, we are told, can be relied upon to produce an average of one hundred bolls to the stalk; and may be planted in rows of not more than two feet and a half apart, and may be left much closer in the drill than the Cotton usually grown in this country, as it does not branch out like it. Mr. Cage says he is gathering this season at the rate of 2500 pounds of seed cotton per acre. We understand that he will dispose of a small quantity of this seed; and, therefore, advise our planting friends to embrace the opportunity thus offered of supplying themselves with it.

Judge Turner.

We are informed by a gentleman of high respectability and intelligence, just from Columbus, that the prospects of this venerable and gifted statesman are truly flattering in that section of the State. His bland and dignified deportment, his sober and business habits, and his long and distinguished services, both as a Judge and Legislator, to this State, render him an eminently suitable candidate for the office af Governor. And we have no doubt, that the people of this State, more especially those who have been long resident in it, and can therefore the better appreciate him, feel gratified to have the opportunity now afforded of rewarding an old and tried public servant, by electing him to the highest office in their gift. We were informed a week or two since, by a late distinguished Senator, in the Legislature, who lives in the same county with Judge Turner, and who is a Van Buren man, we believe, that the voters of both parties in Franklin and the adjacent counties, will unite in warmly supporting him for the office of Governor.

For the Madison Whig Advocate.

Political Disquisitions.--No. 8.

Agreeably to the promise made in my last number, I will now proceed to give a short review of some of the prominent objections urged by Gen. Jackson in his veto of the bill which passed the two houses of Congress in 1832, to re-charter the United States Bank. The charter of 1816, it required much discussion to make satisfactory to the numerous friends of that day of a National Bank; but after it was ultimately framed and passed, it was considered an improvement upon that of 1791, which better experience enabled the Congress of 1816 to make. And so the bill, which was prepared and passed the two houses, and vetoed by President Jackson in 1832, was considered an improvement upon the charter of 1816. This improvement upon an improvement is what President Jackson thought was not constitutional "*in all its features*." Let us notice these awful "features" which the legal acumen of the "illustrious predecessor," enabled him to discover threatened destruction to the *magna charta* of American liberty, altho' they had escaped the narrow vision of the minds of such men in both houses of Congress, as the States and the people thought had minds "so keen as to split a hair, and so powerful as to rive a rock of adamant."

He commenced his objections to the unconstitutional "features" of the bill before him by saying, that the Congress of 1816, by granting a charter took from "their successors for twenty years" the power of creating any other banks, and the bill before him to re-charter it, proposed "to abolish it for fifteen years longer;" that if Congress possessed this power, "it was possessed by one Congress as well as another, and by all Congresses alike, and alike at *every session;*" and that therefore as this bill proposed to take away the power from Congress *at the next session* to repeal it, therefore, it was not constitutional!!

Such reasoning—if indeed it deserves to be dignified by calling it reasoning—should be considered a disgrace to the logical powers of even the veriest tyro in jurisprudence. But coming as it did from one who was deemed by an Eastern University worthy the degree of L. L. D.—one who, at the time it was brought forth, filled the first office in the gift of the people of this great Republic—what shall we say it? It cannot be considered sound, because if carried out it would lead to the grossest absurdity. Almost every act of the Federal Government might with equal truth be proved to be unconstitutional, and therefore null and void. To give an instance. The President has the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties. A treaty is a contract between two or more independent nations, which is binding on them. Suppose, then, that Mr. Van Buren, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, should make a treaty with France to continue in force for ten years, which he evidently has the power to do. According to the logic of President Jackson, one President has as much power to make treaties as another, and to do this at every session of the Senate; and, therefore, inasmuch as this treaty would take from succeeding Presidents for ten years the power of altering it or making a new one inconsistent therewith, without the consent of France, it would be unconstitutional and not binding upon the United States!!

President Jackson should have recollected that there is a very material difference between a *law*, which is a rule prescribed by the Government to regulate the conduct of the people who live under it, and a *contract* which may exist in the shape of a *treaty* or a *bank charter*. Every Congress, "at every *session*," has the power, most unquestionably, to repeal a *law* enacted by a preceding one; but it cannot repeal a *contract*, because there must be at least two parties to every contract, and the consent of both is necessary to its abrogation. In the granting of a bank charter, as well as in the formation of a treaty, the action of the Government is induced by public necessity and intended to conduce to the public good:—the bank as affording a sound uniform and convenient currency, as equalising exchanges, as a fiscal agent of the Government, and the treaty, to regulate our intercourse with foreign nations. This objection is, then, sufficiently answered by reducing it to an absurdity.

The next objection is as follows: "The several States reserved the power at the formation of the constitution, to regulate and controul, titles and transfers of real property, and most, if not all of them, have laws disqualifying aliens from acquiring or holding lands within their limits. But this act, in disregard of the undoubted right of the States to prescribe such disqualifications, gives to aliens, stockholders in this bank, an interest and title, as members of the corporation, to all the real property it may acquire within any of the States of this Union. This privilege granted to aliens is not "*necessary*" to enable the bank to perform its public duties, nor in any sense "*proper*," because it is vitally subversive of the rights of the States."

Now it appears to me very strange, indeed, that objections are made to "aliens" holding stock in a United States Bank, when it is a fact well known that nearly all the States since the commencement of Gen. Jackson's "experiment," have incorporated banks which have gone into operation upon money borrowed from "aliens." Nay, they have gone so far, some of them, as to pledge their faith for the return of the money. These State banks based upon the capital of "aliens," likewise acquire "an interest and title" to real estate, and no fuss is made about it. I doubt very much whether there is a State in the Union which has prohibited "aliens" from holding stock in her Banks. They are on the contrary glad to get such stock-holders, as they bring capital into the country. All these banks acquire real estate; and if so, the alien stock-holders, as such must acquire an interest in it, to the subversion of State rights, as the Gen. would say. But even admitting this objection well founded, it is by no means an unanswerable one to the establishment of a National Bank; for such an institution can be created without "aliens" holding stock. The capitalists of the United States would seek such an investment with the greatest avidity, when they would not look at the stock of a State Bank. Many a rusty dollar, which has slept quietly in the chests of misers since the "war upon the currency," upon credit, and upon public confidence commenced, would like Lazarus come forth and contribute to the completion of its capital. Industry and enterprise would look forward with confidence to their reward, and the cheering sun of prosperity once more shine upon the blighted fortunes and crippled energies of a great people.

Another objection to the bill is in the following language: "The Government of the United States have no constitutional power to purchase lands within the States, except "for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings," and even for these objects only "by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be." By making themselves stock-holders in the bank, and granting to the corporation the power to purchase lands for other purposes, they assume a power not granted in the constitution, and grant to others what they do not themselves possess."

The yearly practice of the Government under every administration from Washington down, sufficiently refutes this reasoning. The position is, that the United States cannot purchase lands within the limits of any of the States without the consent of the Legislature thereof, and even then not a foot can be obtained except "for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings." I cannot perceive the difference so far as the constitution is concerned between *holding* lands within the States without the consent of the Legislatures thereof, and "*purchasing*" the same without such consent. And it is well known that the Federal Government has held, if it does not now hold, lands in all the States of the Union, save the original thirteen; and the constitutional power to do so with or without the consent of the Legislatures has never been questioned, even when the object of holding was, not to erect forts &c., upon, but to sell or otherwise dispose of them for the public welfare. Moreover, the Federal Government has in many instances "*purchased*" lands within the States from the Indian tribes, without the consent of the Legislatures, and this with the avowed intention—not to build forts, &c., upon them, (for it would take all the money the sub-treasurers could steal in a thousand years to erect forts upon all the thousands and thousands more of the Government lands bought within the States)—but to sell again. Madison county and the counties north of it are called by the people in the southern part of this State, emphatically, "the purchase." And what became of President Jackson's constitutional scruples when he as the agent of the Federal Government "*purchased*" them? If he thought at the time he did so, that the United States could not buy or hold lands within the States, except to build forts, &c. upon, how did he reconcile his "*purchase*" with the solemn oath he took to "preserve, protect, and defend, the constitution of the United States!" If his reasoning be sound, then, not a single individual in Madison county or the counties north of it has a good legal title to his land; for if the United States could not "purchase" or hold them without the consent of the Legislature (which was not asked) and even with such consent only to build forts, &c. upon, and they were bought to sell again, according to Gen. Jackson's reasoning, the "purchase" was in violation of the constitution, and, of course, null and void. And if the "purchase" was null and void, the United States having no title, could, consequently, convey none to those who bought from the Government.

It would seem that one who the sage professors of an ancient University deemed worthy the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws, and to whom, according to Major Downing, they "gibbered away like all nater in latting," he the "Gineral not letting on"—I say it would not appear unreasonable to expect that such a one would know that there is a material difference between a fee-simple in the soil and the power of Legislation over it. I cannot perceive any difference so far as the constitution is concerned between the United States buying from white people or from Indians. The constitution does not indeed require the consent of the legislatures, in particular cases, to the "purchase" of lands; but it is for the obtaining such lands, only, as Congress may wish to exercise exclusive legislation over. The United States may buy lands of the citizens of the States without the consent of the legislatures thereof; but cannot without such consent exercise exclusive legislation over it when bought; for if this could be done every vestige of State sovereignty would be annihilated. It seems to me, therefore, that this constitutional objection is farfetched, absurd and untenable.

The fourth objection is one which the writer of these disquisitions thinks, no one in the least acquainted with political economy ought to have made. It is this: As "the old Bank of the United States possessed a capital of only eleven millions, which was found fully sufficient to enable it, with despatch and safety to perform all the functions required of it by the Government," and that as "the capital of the present Bank is thirty-five millions of dollars—at least twenty-four more than experience has proved to be necessary to enable a bank to perform its public functions," therefore, it is not constitutional.

At the period of the establishment of the old United States Bank, that of 1791, the population of the Union was about 4,000,000. In 1832, the year in which this objection was made, the population had increased to about 14,000,000. The reasoning of President Jackson amounts to this, then, that as a capital of $11,000,000, was sufficient for the fiscal concerns of four millions of people, therefore, the same capital was enough to answer the purposes of the country when its population had increased to fourteen millions. Again: The total amount of revenue received into the Treasury of the United States in 1791, exclusive of loans and treasury notes was $4,418,-915 19; and the amount received in 1832 was, $31,866,561 16. According to Gen. Jackson's ratiocination, if a capital of eleven millions was sufficient to enable a bank to perform its duties as a fiscal agent of the Government, when its revenue was about four millions, ergo, the same amount of capital will do when its revenues shall have increased to nearly eight times that amount. This method of reasoning is truly sui generis—it is perfectly omnipotent; for by it one may arrive at any conclusion he may wish, whether it follow the premises or not. I should, perhaps, commit no greater absurdity were I to declare that the swaddling clothes of an infant will be sufficient to clothe it after it shall have arrived at manhood; or were I to assert that the same quantity of bread stuffs that was sufficient to feed a nation consisting of four millions, was enough, also, to supply that nation after it had increased in numbers four fold.

The objection he made, on the ground that the charter did not give to the States the right to tax its banking capital, has but little weight. Every State in the Union is interested in the United States Treasury. By the charter of 1816 the United States Bank agreed to pay into this treasury one million and a half as a bonus for the banking privileges thereby granted. And by the bill to recharter it, which President Jackson vetoed, the Bank was to pay a like bonus of three millions!! And all this immense amount thus paid into a treasury in which every man in the whole Union is equally interested. What greater tax would any just man wish to make upon an institution, which in addition to this heavy tax bound itself, without charging the Government one cent therefor, to receive, safe-keep, transfer and disburse the vast revenues of the Union! This bonus, it must be recollected, was to be paid in advance, and amounted to about eight per cent on her capital, which is, if I mistake not, about sixteen times greater than the annual tax paid into our State Treasury by our local banks for similar banking privileges!! These latter banks pay a tax of only 25 cents per share, or ¼ of 1 per cent. annually. If the vetoed bill had charged the United States Bank the same for fifteen years, the time for which it was proposed to be re-chartered, the tax which was to be called a bonus would have been only about $2,000,000. Whereas the bonus it agreed to pay in advance, if we include the interest on it, would be equal to about $6,000,000!!! Thus it appears that the petty State Banks which Gen. Jackson promised the people would furnish a better currency than the United States Bank, of capital to the same amount have a difference in their favor, so far as taxation is concerned, of about $2,000,000. And with this immense difference in their favor, they have utterly failed to accomplish what he so sanguinely promised. Yet we are to be told, that because every State would not be allowed to tax the United States Bank at pleasure—a bank eminently useful to them in preserving a sound and uniform currency—the bank, forsooth, should not exist!!!

These are the mighty objections put forth under the sanction of a great name, to satisfy a people mighty in resources and distinguished for intelligence, that a National Bank is unnecessary and improper. After weighing them with proper candor, the reader will, I am convinced, agree with me in believing, that it was the influence of a mighty name, and not their own intrinsic strength, which caused them to receive for a short time the approbation of an enlightened people.

I have now done with precedent and authority; and in my next number will endeavor to give a *condensation* of the arguments upon the constitutional question of a National Bank.

HAWK-EYE.

For the Madison Whig Advocate.

To the Chivalry of Madison County!!!

The Madison Invincibles will meet on Thursday evening the 24th inst. at 7 o'clock, at the Court Room, in Canton, for the purpose of re-organizing the company, electing officers, receiving additional members, adopting by-laws, &c. Those who have already been elected members of the corps and have signed the Constitution, are desired and expected to attend, and all those who anticipate attaching themselves to the company had better make application on that evening, as it will be a fa[illegible] apparently, and they are [illegible] in the electing of their officers. Of the importance of a well regulated company in this place, all are aware. Discipline is [illegible] the shield of safety, and it is a fact which all experience proves, that Volunteer Companies are superior in this respect to any others. That danger is constantly lurking around us, is manifest to all, and our common safety requires that we should place ourselves in a situation to repel it. This can be done in no way so well as that above proposed. Aside from this—which is sufficient inducement—the pride of the county is appealed to. In almost every county of the State, flourishing Volunteer Companies are in existence, and shall it appear that Madison has less pride, less chivalry, than other counties below her in point of population and general respectability. The pride of the young men of this county, and a desire of continual safety are the inducements for the formation of a Volunteer Company at Canton, and it is hoped all will feel themselves interested.

A. MEMBER.

SLANDER REFUTED.—Some time since the Mississippian insinuated that Chancellor Turner had called upon Franklin E. Plummer, Esq. to write him a circular, and intimated that Mr. Plummer had performed that duty for Judge T. upon a former occasion. A number of the citizens of Grenada, the place of Mr P's. residence, called upon him to state the facts of the case, and received the following certificate from him, which silences at once and forever the pitiful imputation. The certificate is preceded by a card from the gentlemen who called upon Mr. Plummer.—*Vicksburg Whig.*

CHANCELLOR TURNER.
To the Public.

Rumors having obtained circulation in the community, and through the columns of the Mississippian, to the effect that Chancellor Turner, the whig candidate for Governor in Mississippi had visited Hon. F. E. Plummer in the town of Grenada, and requested him to write a circular in his behalf to the people; the friends of Chancellor Turner considered the [illegible] of a request at once so humiliating and degrading, drew from Mr. Plummer the following certificate, which stamps the originator of such a report with the most infamous motives and the blackest falsehood.

The community of Grenada has been greatly excited about this report, and while the facts in the case would show truth disregarded and honor sacrificed, the friends of Mr. Turner are content to forever stifle the report by the certificate of him who has been referred to as good authority for the rumor.

F. A. TYLER,
C. S. SMITH,
J. L. HAWKINS,
J. M. HOWARD,
W. H. CRENSHAW,
J. C. ABBOTT.

[Card.]

I, Franklin E. Plummer, do hereby certify that I never did write a circular for the Hon. Edward Turner, or any other political document in his favor, at his request; nor did he at any time, or on any occasion, ever request me to write for him a circular or other political document.

F. E. PLUMMER.
Grenada, Oct. 4, 1839.

OLD CLAIBORNE.—The barbecue given to Mr. Prentiss on Tuesday last, in this truly republican county was a brilliant affair, and cannot fail to have the happiest effect in the approaching contest. The dinner was a sumptuous one and prepared in excellent style and good taste, and was partaken of by from 600 to 700 persons. The best spirit seemed to prevail among our friends there, and judging from what we saw, the whigs of Claiborne will give a good account of themselves in November.—The speech of Mr. Prentiss was one of the best we ever heard him utter, and was at once powerful, argumentative and eloquent. The numerous tergiversations, and glaring inconsistencies of that political chameleon, Robert J. Walker, were held up to the people in their true colors and exposed with a master hand. The ruinous tendencies of the sub-treasury scheme were handled in a lucid and powerful manner and we do not believe there was one candid man present who did not after hearing Mr. Prentiss, view this measure of the executive with unmitigated loathing and horror. The conclusion of his speech was eloquent beyond description—he dwelt in glowing terms upon the importance of the coming contest, and truly denominated it a battle between the executive and the people—he called upon the whigs, those who had upheld the good old cause in the darkest hour of its adversity, to gird on their armor for one more conflict—to strike one blow more in defence of the constitution. In tones that called up the blood and made it gush with ten fold rapidity through the veins of the gray haired veteran, as well as the more youthful soldiers, he appealed to the whigs to lay aside all considerations but that important one of redeeming the country from the hands of the leagued bands of plunderers who now disgrace it, and for once come up to the rescue with a stern unbroken front. His appeal was responded to by repeated and long continued shouts, which told how truly in feeling and sympathy the audience were with the orator. We have never heard a speech which gave more general satisfaction, and we believe its good effects will be commensurate.

Vicksburg Whig.

HUNTING THE PRESIDENT.—Governor Call, of Florida, lately sent a committee to confer with the President concerning the defence of Florida. The committee have been racing over a large portion of the State of New York to catch His Majesty long enough to have a talk with him, but to the last accounts they could not get up with him. This is a pretty spectacle indeed. The people of one portion of our Territory bleeding under the scalping knife and the tomahawk, and their representatives running all over the country trying to hunt out the President, who is absent from his post and his duties, on an electioneering tour. A correspondent of the New York Times, writing from Saratoga Springs on the 22d Aug. says:—*St. Louis Rep.*

"After Mr. Van Buren had left this morning, a delegation from Florida ar-

[illegible]